

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/519,194	12/22/2004	Nobuaki Yagi	040894-7146	6809
9629 7	590 10/24/2006		EXAM	INER
	EWIS & BOCKIUS LLF		LOPEZ, MICHELLE	
1111 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW WASHINGTON, DC 20004		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	.,		3721	

DATE MAILED: 10/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	_	Q				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/519,194	YAGI ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
-	Michelle Lopez	3721				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPI WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING I Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the maili earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNI .136(a). In no event, however, may a d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON tte, cause the application to become Al	CATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11.	<u>September 2006</u> .					
, <u> </u>	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-6</u> is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>6</u> is/are withdrawn f 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-5</u> is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin 10) The drawing(s) filed on 29 June 2006 is/are: Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre	a) accepted or b) objection accepted or b) objection accepted or b) objection is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)				
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/29/06. 		(s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application 				

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to the amendment field on 9/11/06.

Drawings

Figure s 10 and 11 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art--because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). Corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

The replacement drawings of Figures 10 and 11 marked "Related Art" are not approved since the term has little meaning. These figures are either prior art, in which case the figures need to be labeled as such, or are not prior art in which case no markings are necessary. Since these figures are described in the "Background to the Invnetion" portion of the specification they seem to be directed to prior art.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

⁽b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Akizawa 5,009,355.

Akizawa discloses an electric stapler comprising a magazine portion 26, a staple striking portion 7, a driver, and a motor; a table 4 supported by a main body frame 1 of the electric stapler, and including a clincher mechanism for folding to bend a leg portion of the staple penetrated through the sheets along the sheets as shown in Fig. 2, and a wing piece formed at the table; and locking means 6 formed between the wing piece of the table and the main body frame, wherein pivoting force in an opening direction of the table is hampered by engaging the locking means with the wing piece as shown in Fig. 1a (claim 1); wherein the locking means 6 comprises a lock plate including a locking pin 17 engangeable with the wing piece at one end thereof and supported by the main body frame at other end side thereof, and wherein by engaging the locking pin with the wing piece from being pivoted the pivoting force in the opening direction of the table is hampered (claim 2); the locking means further comprises an operating piece 13 formed at the lock plate and an operating cam 14 arranged to be brought into contact with and to be separated from the operating piece, and a spring (claim 3).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akizawa 5,009,355 in view of Kanai 5,836,502.

Page 4

Akizawa discloses an electric stapler with a locking mechanism substantially as claimed as discussed above, but does not disclose wherein the locking means comprises an eccentric cam supported by a main body frame and engageable with a wing piece. However, Kanai shows electric stapler comprising a table supported by a main body frame and having a wing piece 11, and a locking mechanism comprising an eccentric cam 10 engageable with the wing piece 11 for the purpose of actuating the wing piece such that performing a staple driving operation and thereafter stopping the actuation of the wing piece in an opening direction during the staple driving operation as shown in col. 15; 64-67 and col. 16; 1-10. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to use an eccentric cam on the locking mechanism of Magnusson's as taught by Kanai to properly lock the wing piece in an opening direction during a staple driving operation.

Kanai also teaches the concept of engaging teeth 54,55 and locking teeth at 52 (claim 5).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect Magnusson have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Art Unit: 3721

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michelle Lopez whose telephone number is 571-272-4464. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday: 8:00 am - 6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rinaldi Rada can be reached on 571-272-4467. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ML